



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

**Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited**

Near East & South Asia

INDIA

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19980129 138

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

Near East & South Asia

INDIA

JPRS-NEA-92-150

CONTENTS

9 November 1992

POLITICAL

International Affairs

BJP Questions Wheat Deal With U.S. [THE TIMES OF INDIA 8 Oct]	1
Chavan Meeting With UK's Major Reported [THE TIMES OF INDIA 24 Sep]	1
Rao Meets Press on Return From France [THE TIMES OF INDIA 2 Oct]	2

Regional Affairs

Papers Report Visit by Sri Lankan President	2
2 Oct Press Conference [THE HINDU 3 Oct]	2
Visit Results Noted [THE TIMES OF INDIA 7 Oct]	3

Internal Affairs

Tribals Discouraged by Failure of Jharkhand Demand [ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA 29 Jul]	4
Ramifications of Jharkhand Movement Stalling	6
Government Proceeds Cautiously on Jharkhand Solution [ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA 10 Sep]	6
Jharkhand Statehood Might Incite Other Political Groups [ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA 10 Sep]	7
Paper Interviews Janata President Swamy [THE TELEGRAPH 5 Sep]	8
Yadav Forms New Political Party [THE TIMES OF INDIA 30 Sep]	11
RBI Head Allegedly Knew of Security Scam [THE STATESMAN 18 Sep]	11
VHP Leader Meets Press on Ayodhya Issue [THE HINDU 21 Sep]	12

SOCIAL ISSUES

Officials Tell State of Nuclear Industry [PATRIOT 22 Sep]	14
Progress Reported in Solar Technology [THE HINDU 19 Sep]	15

International Affairs

BJP Questions Wheat Deal With U.S.

93AS0129A Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 8 Oct 92 p 13

[Text] New Delhi, October 7: Claiming that there was something mystifying about the government's move to import wheat from the United States, the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party] today said several points arose from the recent deal and sought an explanation from the government on the questionable transactions.

In a statement here, the party vice-presidents, Mr. K.R. Malkani and Mr. Jana Krishnamurthi, said the only beneficiaries of such queer transactions were the importers, exporters, shippers, insurers and the commission-collectors. An interesting aspect was that the Union minister for food was opposed to such imports, they claimed.

They noted that in February, the government had declared its intention to import one million tonnes of wheat even though the country had had three consecutive bumper crops and a fourth one was about to be harvested. The monsoon had belied predictions of meteorologists in the prime minister's office that this year the rains would be sub-normal, they said.

The BJP leaders said only recently, the government imported wheat, from Australia and later from Canada. Now it had gone for imports from the United States at over \$110 per tonne. This raised several questions, they said.

At \$110 per tonne, it will cost more than Rs. 300 a quintal. Add to this freight and insurance, demurrage and storage, and it will cost the government something like Rs. 450 a quintal. Why was the government willing to pay Rs. 450 a quintal for American wheat, but not more than Rs. 280 per quintal for superior Indian wheat, they asked.

They claimed that the government was allegedly bent upon discriminating against Indian farmers and making the country dependent on food imports. The imports would several strain the country's port and rail facilities, they added.

While India had been reducing subsidy on fertilisers and other agro-inputs, the United States and other countries were increasing them, they said.

The BJP leaders wondered if the subsidies were being cut at the behest of the IMF. It had been computed that U.S. subsidy to agriculture was thrice that of India's while west European was seven times and Japanese ten times than India's, they said.

A queer aspect of the matter was that only a few months back, India exported a million tonnes of wheat at \$105 a tonne.

Chavan Meeting With UK's Major Reported

93AS0095A Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 24 Sep 92 p 13

[Article by L.K. Sharma: "UK To Help India Curb Terrorism"]

[Text] London, Sept. 23—The British Prime Minister, Mr. John Major, said today that his government is committed to cooperate with India in curbing terrorism and drug trafficking, and evinced personal interest in strengthening relations between Britain and India.

He told the home minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan, that the extradition treaty signed here yesterday would give a clear signal to all concerned that Britain and India are closely cooperating in combatting terrorism. Mr. Chavan said Pakistan is indulging in state-sponsored terrorism and, thereby, creating difficulties for India in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr. Major said he is looking forward to visiting India early next year at the invitation of the Prime Minister, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao, whose message was conveyed to him by the visiting Indian home minister. The home minister was accompanied by the Indian high commissioner, Mr. L.M. Singhvi, for the meeting which materialised despite the Prime Minister's busy schedule on the eve of a Commons debate on the currency crisis. This was seen by the Indian delegation as a special gesture.

Mr. Chavan briefed Mr. Major on Indo-Pak relations, the menace of terrorism and the situation in Punjab and Kashmir. Mr. Major appreciated the Indian government's decision to hold elections in Punjab. Mr. Chavan told him that the government planned to have elections in Jammu and Kashmir also as soon as the situation permitted.

Mr. Chavan referred to Pakistan's role and said that while condemning any Libyan role in the hijacking of civilian aircraft, it should not be forgotten that an Indian aircraft was also hijacked in the past.

The home minister talked about the improvement in the situation in Punjab and the prospect of a return to normalcy and the revival of the democratic process in Kashmir.

The Prime Minister, as well as the British home secretary, Mr. Kenneth Clark, appreciated the new initiative taken by India in the field of human rights. The home minister said he was prepared to receive a delegation of the Amnesty International. Mr. Chavan and Mr. Clarke [as published] signed the extradition treaty and an agreement on the confiscation of assets of terrorists and drug traffickers yesterday. Britain has similar treaties with West European countries and the United States. This is the first extradition treaty of this kind that Britain has signed with a non-European country.

Later, Mr. Chavan told reporters that the extradition treaty and the agreement on the confiscation of funds of drug traffickers and terrorists would help India combat their activities. He said London is a big centre from where the terrorists send funds to India for the purchase of arms and for training. There is a parallel banking system through which these secret funds are passed and the sums involved cannot be estimated. Some of the funds are collected from innocent people on one pretext or another. The money to finance terrorist activities in India also goes to Pakistan.

He said he would be glad to receive a delegation of the Amnesty International, initially on a one-time basis. The government wants to remove any misunderstanding because in the past it had noticed that some human rights organisations had publicised unverified reports with a view to maligning India.

On Jammu and Kashmir, the home minister said the situation had improved somewhat as people are now demonstrating against the terrorists. It is necessary to have elections in Jammu and Kashmir also, and these could be held within a year, he said. The Kashmiri refugees are being helped by the government, but they should go back to the state to frustrate the attempts of the terrorists who have attacked and threatened both Hindus as well as affluent Muslims.

Mr. Chavan, like the finance minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh, was confronted with the demand for dual nationality for non-resident Indians. His reply was non-committal. He said there are security aspects to the problem. Some terrorists have been found to possess as many as five passports. He would consult the law ministry to find out if it was possible for the NRIs [Nonresident Indian] to take some of the advantages of dual nationality.

Rao Meets Press on Return From France

93AS0133A Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 2 Oct 92 p 1

[Text] New Delhi, Oct. 1—India and France will hold discussions on combatting terrorism soon, the Prime Minister, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao, said today.

Mr. Rao told presspersons on his return from a three-day visit to Paris that one of the areas on which views had converged was on the need to counter terrorism. The French, he said, are "very, very concerned" about terrorism, particularly terrorism from across the border. He added that the two countries will discuss the issue soon.

According to Mr. Rao, the agreement to avoid double taxation, which was signed during his visit, would go a long way in encouraging French investment in India. The industry minister of France, who will visit India in January has promised to bring along a delegation of industrialists, he said. This will give them an opportunity to talk to Indian businessmen.

Mr. Rao said he had explained to French leaders the qualitative changes India is making in its economic policies so as to make it attractive to investors.

On their part, the French leaders expressed the view that the European Community would not be a fortress closed to outsiders, Mr. Rao said. In fact, the Prime Minister stated that he had been assured that after unification it would not become inward-looking but would open up, perhaps resulting in the enhancement of trade and economic cooperation with developing countries.

The Prime Minister, however, parried questions about France's position on the supply of enriched uranium and the transfer of rocket technology, and merely remarked that "specific items were discussed with the ministers

concerned" and while there had been agreement in some areas, in other cases more discussions would take place both at official and ministerial levels.

He said outstanding issues where private companies have been involved in litigation, were also considered.

Mr. Rao said that though France had decided to sign the nonproliferation treaty [NPT], India's position that the treaty needs to be revised to make it "nondiscriminatory and global" was taken serious note of. The Prime Minister said he had impression that France agrees.

However, India's dialogue with France on the NPT was not related the treaty in its present form, but how it should be changed what the changed of nonproliferation should be. India is also conducting similar talks with the United States, Mr. Rao said.

Regional Affairs

Papers Report Visit by Sri Lankan President

2 Oct Press Conference

93AS0131A Madras THE HINDU in English 3 Oct 92
[no page given]

[Article by K.K. Katyal]

[Text] New Delhi, Oct. 2—The Sri Lankan President, Mr. R. Premadasa, now here, finds a marked improvement in his country's relations with India after the assumption of power by Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao. "After last year's elections in India, our relations have grown from strength to strength. We have no problems. We see things from the same perspective," he said, in a talk with a group of journalists at the Rashtrapati Bhavan today.

Contrary to his reputation as a press-shy politician, Mr. Premadasa was unusually forthcoming at an hour-long question-answer session. He dealt with queries with skill, patience and good humour, if not always with the same degree of conviction. The questions related to SAARC [South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation] (his visit here was in his capacity as the chairman of the regional association), the domestic problems of Sri Lanka and its relations with India.

On his relations with Mr. Rao, he said "We have an unwritten agreement to work together." This, of course, reflected his optimism about the bilateral relationship but was also a rhetorical parrying of questions on the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement. He did not give a direct reply, when asked about his Government's view on the status of the agreement, impliedly suggesting that it was different from the perception of New Delhi. In his banquet speech last night, for instance, the President, Dr. S.D. Sharma, described the agreement as a sincere attempt to resolve the ethnic conflict in the island.

In this context, Mr. Premadasa recalled the promises contained in his party's election manifesto—that he would work for the withdrawal of the Indian Peace-Keeping Force [IPKF] and establish his country's relations with

India on the basis of reciprocity. He noted with satisfaction the fulfilment of the first promise—and paid a tribute to India, and the Government of the day, headed by Mr. V.P. Singh for the pullout of the IPKF.

'No Talks With LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam] Now'

As for the second issue, he mentioned his Government's preference for a treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation on the model of India's arrangement with the erstwhile Soviet Union. Sri Lanka, he said, gave a draft of the treaty (as visualised by his Government) but did not explain why there was no movement forward. As was known, India submitted a counterdraft which was not liked by Sri Lanka and, from then on there has been no follow-up.

He was asked whether the LTTE's suspected complicity in the assassination of the former Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi, would affect his Government's relations with India—or with the Tigers. These, he replied, were separate issues which should not be mixed. He was non-committal on a hypothetical question whether he would agree to India's request for the extradition of the LTTE chief, Prabhakaran, if he was caught. There were separate enactments for all these things—was another observation by him.

Mr. Premadasa was emphatic that there were no negotiations now between his Government and the LTTE. The Government did talk to the Tigers some time back but that phase was over. He had insisted on three conditions—one, the LTTE must stop the use of arms; two, it should agree to join the democratic process; and three, it should recognise the right of other (Tamil) parties to contest the elections. "We stretched our hand in friendship," he said regretting the absence of the desired response. It was clear that the talks could be resumed only if these conditions were accepted by the LTTE. Did he trust the LTTE? "Trusting is different, negotiating is different", was his reply.

As for the problems of the north-eastern province, Mr. Premadasa narrated the various developments leading to the take-over of the administration of the province after its council adopted a resolution, running counter to the Sri Lankan constitution. There was no provision for a mid-term poll, he said, noting that a Joint Select Committee of Parliament was now engaged in evolving consensus on next steps (to end the present stalemate).

No Mid-term Poll

The questions on the SAARC related to the tasks for the next summit—in Dhaka in December—the progress of its activities, possible expansion. One of the main issues, to be taken up at Dhaka, is the proposal for a treaty envisaging the South Asian Preferential Trade Agreement. He was asked about the prospects of its adoption, in view of Pakistan's reservations. Mr. Premadasa said he was not aware of any reservations but added: "We will have to study various aspects of cooperation." As he saw it, all the member countries were keen on the promotion of trade. Sri Lanka had taken certain unilateral steps—like the

decision to buy from the region what was available there, because "we can get it quicker and cheaper." He was confident that the SAARC nations could cooperate to meet the various challenges, especially now that they have adopted the same policy of liberalised economies.

Was India's size and the scale of its resources a hindrance in the way of cooperation in South Asia? If India is big in size, it has also big problems, he said. Was not the asymmetry a major cause for the prevailing distrust? What would he like India to do to remove these impressions? Like an elder brother, possessing maturity, it could help others to get over their immaturity, he said, adding: "it all depends on behaviour."

Two Proposals

Terrorism in the region, he told a questioner, had been the subject of study by experts (within the parameters of the SAARC convention). They had made two proposals—one for the establishment of a network for the exchange of information on counter-terrorism and the other for setting up a data bank. The problem of refugees, he said, could be tackled either bilaterally, regionally or unilaterally.

It was for the summit, Mr. Premadasa said, to consider the various suggestions for additions to the SAARC—including the interest shown by Iran for an observer status.

Visit Results Noted

*93AS0131B Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 7 Oct 92 p 13*

[Text] New Delhi, October 6—There has been no change in the Indian stand that the 1987 India-Sri Lankan accord provides the basic framework for settlement of the Tamils problem, though the agreement was not mentioned specifically in the joint communique issued at the end of the three-day visit by the Sri Lankan President, Mr. Ranasinghe Premadasa, on Saturday.

The issue is understood to have taken up as much as 25 minutes at the one-to-one meeting between Mr. Premadasa and the Prime Minister, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

At his banquet speech, the President, Dr. S.D. Sharma, had made a specific reference to the 1987 agreement which he described as a "sincere attempt to resolve the ethnic problem that had sadly gone on for well over a decade." He went on to emphasise that what was needed was "an effective devolution of powers within the framework of a united Sri Lanka in which all citizens of the country would be able to live a secure life with honour and dignity as equal citizens."

India continues to believe that merger of the northern and eastern provinces with proper devolution of powers is vital for an effective and lasting solution to the ethnic problem, and this point is believed to have been underscored by Mr. Rao as well in his discussions with Mr. Premadasa.

However, a direct reference to the accord was apparently avoided in the communique in keeping with New Delhi's desire to minimise tension and forestall any controversy. Mr. Premadasa has made no secret of the fact that he

considers the 1987 accord, signed by his predecessor, Mr. J. Jayewardhane, "one-sided."

According to informed sources, the impression in some quarters that India lacks a clear-cut policy on Sri Lanka is erroneous. They assert that the policy being followed by the present government is basically the same as that pursued during Mr. Rajiv Gandhi's tenure. They, however, point out that Mr. Narasimha Rao, in his characteristic style, has chosen to adopt a "low-key approach" to such issues, consistent with his non-confrontationist attitude and his policy of improving relations with neighbouring countries.

In fact, the decision to upgrade Mr. Premadasa's "working visit" in his capacity as chairman of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) to a state visit was taken by the government as part of this policy and to underline the special relationship between the two countries.

The sources point out that as far as Mr. Premadasa's policies for achieving his objectives relating to the ethnic issue are concerned, New Delhi's attitude is determined by its desire that these should not adversely affect India. The two countries are separated by a distance of only about 30 km and any solution outside the framework of the 1987 accord might affect India.

As for the LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam], which has been outlawed in this country following its alleged involvement in the Rajiv Gandhi assassination, India's stand was made amply clear by Mr. Rao. The Prime Minister, while underlining the need for a fair and equitable settlement of the Tamils issue, stated that "all those people should be involved in these efforts who have eschewed the path of violence."

Internal Affairs

Tribals Discouraged by Failure of Jharkhand Demand

92AS1440A Calcutta ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA
in Bengali 29 Jul 92 p 4

[Article by Sivdas Bandyopadhyay: "The Tribals Are Discouraged by the Direction of the Jharkhand Movement"]

[Text] Recently another tragic drama took place in the area known as Jharkhand, which consists of 18 mineral rich districts in the southern part of the state of Bihar. The tribal people, who had been hoping for almost three decades to have their separate entity recognized, have seen this kind of drama several times in the past. A year ago, or more, specifically before the last general election, it appeared that JMM (Jharkhand Mukti Morcha) would be able to establish leadership in place of the people who had misled this movement in the past. In fact, this movement was going to achieve the status of union territory or self-administered region like the Gorkha National Liberation Front achieved in Darjeeling, if not the status of a full-fledged state. But today, JMM or the whole Jharkhand movement, which had been trying to achieve a separate identity, is almost broken.

As in all other fields in life, so it is in politics also, nothing is achieved after hoping for more than one thing at a time. In the case of the JMM, it not only wanted to get two things at a time, it also tried to step on four boats at one time. On one side, there was the Central Government, which had been playing its cards very skillfully. In the name of negotiation, the Central Government occasionally placed bait in front of the movement, like throwing pieces of carrots in front of rabbits. In that proverb, a stick was finally used to punish the rabbits. But in the case of this movement, nothing of that sort has yet been seen.

The behavior and the partial treatment by the Central Government of the issue were always determined from the perspective of its attitude toward the Janata Dal government in Bihar. The Central Government's main objective was the creation of confusion and division within the JMM. The Janata Dal government in Bihar and the majority of Laloo Prasad Yadav's government in the state assembly depend to a large extent on JMM support. After several bilateral and tripartite negotiations held in Patna and New Delhi, a joint committee was formed to do the preliminary work in the process of granting Jharkhand the status of a self-administered region.

The role of Laloo Prasad was not less important in this context. The most important thing to him is to keep support for his government. A few months ago, after repeated consultations with JMM and other important leaders, Yadav formed a committee. The main task of this committee was to prepare the paperwork for status of a self-administered area for the Jharkhand region. A self-administered region on the model of the Gorkha Hill Council of Darjeeling was considered, although nobody will agree that the Hill Council was a successful experiment. Just to make JMM happy, Yadav hastily passed the bill in the state assembly and sent it immediately to the Central Government for its approval. That bill is still being considered by the home ministry. It is unlikely that the Congress government at the Center will allow Laloo Prasad's Janata Party government of Bihar to gain so much political advantage. In fact, Congress usually has gained this type of political advantage until now.

JMM got the third jolt from the local industrial group. With the development of local industries, it is true that deforestation took place to such a great extent that the tribal people were dislodged from their traditional professions and many of them even lost their homes. But in spite of that, over time the lives and the sociopolitical and economic aspects of their livelihoods have come under the control and influence of the industrial circle. It is important and significant that Mr. Rusi Modi, the Chairman of TISCO [Tata Iron and Steel Company], said that he might also join JMM.

In the meantime, the JMM leadership was taken by a group of idealistic, capable, uncompromising, and radical young men from a handful of old and experienced politicians. Some aspects of the protest movement of this new leadership shook all the parties involved. One of the steps of this protest movement was to block all the roads for 10 days so that no industrial or mineral products could be

taken in or out of this region. The clear objective of this action was to force the Central Government of New Delhi, the state government of Patna, and the larger industrial circle of the country to do something about it.

Unfortunately some scattered incidents of undisciplined activities took place at the same time. While negotiations were going on, the vice chancellor of Ranchi University, Dr. Munda, who was once a friend, theorist, and pioneer of the movement, began to sing a different tune. Dr. Munda and some other people said that a new state reorganization commission should be set up to find an agreeable solution to fulfill the hopes and aspirations of the tribal people.

On top of all that, a difference of opinion developed between the younger and the older sections of the JMM leadership. The difference of opinion ultimately centered on whether the JMM leadership would remain happy with the status of a self-ruled region or remain firm in its stand for the creation of a separate state. It became difficult to contain this conflict within the JMM party. The atmosphere became more heated when it centered on the issue of the election of the Rajya Sava, the Upper House of the state assembly, and most important, on the issue of the election of the president. JMM's very base was shaken.

Because Subodh Kant Sahay did not get his party ticket to participate in the Rajya Sava election, the conflict between the younger and the older sections within JMM became wider and more serious. A fighting attitude for the demand of full-state status spread quickly within the younger section of the party workers. On the other hand, some party leaders wanted to solicit political support from circles other than the Janata Party. When the CPI [Communist Party of India] failed to support the decision of one section of the leadership of JMM, it was clear that there was no hope for Subodh Kant Sahay, the former leader of the Socialist Janata Party to win the election. Mr. Laloo Prasad Yadav made an interesting contribution behind this decision. Because he was the person who was able to persuade nine out of 19 JMM members of the state assembly to defy the party whip.

The chief minister of Bihar had reasons for trying to block Mr. Sahay's way to regain his political importance. Mr. Sahay was a minister in the Central Government twice when Rashtriya Morcha and the SJP [Samajwadi Janata Party] were in power and undoubtedly had some political clout. The common workers of the JMM were suspicious, justifiably of course, about Mr. Sahay's motive. What they could not understand was why Mr. Sahay suddenly appeared in the role as emancipator of the common people of Jharkhand. There was apparently no relation between this sense of suspicion and the personal consideration of Laloo Prasad. Mr. Sahay is known basically as a dominant political leader in Ranchi.

Mr. Sahay never hesitated to do anything to fulfill his personal goals. He lost his Lok Sava seat from Ranchi after contesting a Janata Party ticket. Then his attempt to get elected to the Lok Sava from Punjab also failed. So he was desperate to get a seat in the Rajya Sava with the help of JMM. In the colorful political life of Mr. Sahay, there were

many examples of this kind of opportunism even before he became a minister in the central government. Now he probably has to come back to his original place, Ranchi. Perhaps the people of Ranchi may not be happy about this.

In the meantime, Surya Singh Besra, a former member of the Bihar assembly and a militant JMM leader who is currently the general secretary of the aggrieved Jharkhand People's Party, alleged that some of the JMM leaders had become immensely wealthy during the last two years. He demanded that the CBI [Central Bureau of Investigation] investigate this matter. It was alleged that these people became rich through forcefully collecting money by taking advantage of their good relations with Laloo Prasad Yadav and the Congress party. Mr. Besra further alleged that members of the state assembly belonging to JMM sold their votes to the Janata Party, Congress, and BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party] in the recent election for the Rajya Sava seats. In reality, some immoral tribal leaders sold out the Jharkhand movement itself. Mr. Besra threatened that if the Central and the state governments did not accept his demand for a separate Jharkhand state by 15 August, he would start militant activities.

After this, the CPI, the All Jharkhand Students' Union, and the IPF [Indian People's Front] decided to support Mr. Besra's new Jharkhand People's Party. Recently in Patna, Mr. Besra met with Krishna Mardi, JMM leader and a member of parliament, on the question of a joint movement with JMM. It was reported that in that meeting Mr. Besra told Mr. Mardi that the Students' Union would consider this proposal only if all JMM parliamentary members resign. Mr. Mardi agreed to discuss the matter in a meeting of the JMM central committee.

This chaotic condition within JMM is tragic although not new. During the last four decades, the movement of the Jharkhandis for a separate state occasionally took the shape of an election or some other kind of understanding with the ruling party in Bihar or with the Congress. But there was no kind of understanding with the BJP until now. The allegations raised against the leadership today are that some of the leaders have used this movement of the tribal people for their self-interests and thereby delayed for a long time the possibility of having a separate state. Due to this, what has become the condition of this movement today, has no precedent.

If there were a little more sincerity and devotion in this movement, these tribal people could have gained at least something, even without having a separate state. The leaders truly say that these people have been oppressed for a long time. West Bengal, Orissa, and Madhya Pradesh have not much support for the creation of a new state. Now many young workers of the Jharkhand Party are also skeptical about the feasibility of this proposal's materializing. Now the goal of this movement is clear. It wants to have the right of partial self-rule with additional economic and administrative power.

Strikes, economic blockades, ultimatums given to the Bihar government—all of these are part of the movement that is heading toward a dangerous conflict. Because of this

conflict, leaders like Laloo Prasad Yadav, Jagannath Misra, and the industrial circle have more opportunities to divide the movement. They are also able to reduce the popular support of the movement and at the same time play with the JMM members of the assembly and place their trust in a group of members by making them happy. At the present time, Mr. Laloo Prasad will benefit more than the Congress Party or the Central Government in this situation. Due to this strange situation, nobody knows whether the tribal people out of frustration and anger will fall into the BJP's trap. In that case, more violence is possible.

Ramifications of Jharkhand Movement Stalling

Government Proceeds Cautiously on Jharkhand Solution

93AS0018A Calcutta ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA
in Bengali 10 Sep 92 pp 1, 3

[Text] Staff Reporter, New Delhi, 9 September—The council of ministers at the Center and the [ruling] Congress Party stand divided on the question of whether the people of Jharkhand should be granted a separate state or union territory. Although Jharkhand was discussed tonight at the political committee meeting of the council of ministers in New Delhi, no decision was made. According to several official sources, the government will make no decision on this matter hurriedly, without first thoroughly analyzing the reactions of all related groups.

There is no doubt that Home Minister S.B. Chavan favors granting the people of Jharkhand either a separate state or union territory. He has already hinted at his meetings with the leaders of the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha [JMM—Liberation Front]. In the same tone he told some of his colleagues in the council of ministers that the discontent of the people in the tribal majority districts in Bihar has reached such a level that rejection of the Jharkhand people's demands would cause bloodshed and the need to dispatch troops in order to attempt to maintain temporary control there. To follow that path would mean further complication of the problem and make it more difficult to deal with the situation. Chavan also said the same thing at the CCP [expansion not given] meeting tonight. However, at the same time he mentioned that he did not say at a press conference in Pune yesterday that the Jharkhand problem will be resolved by 15 September. Nor did he say that the Central Government is not considering the third alternative—setting up a self-ruled council there.

Among the central ministers, veteran Bihar leader Sitaram Kesri has stood by the home minister on this issue. He has notified Chavan in writing that the demands of the people of Jharkhand should be accepted. Kesri said that it is proper to accept the demands of the tribal people who have been the victims of neglect for a long time. But other central ministers who oppose the division of Bihar are of the opinion that acceptance of the Jharkhand demand would fuel similar movements in other states; and this cannot be accepted under any circumstances. Similarly, although the followers of the Congress Party in the

Jharkhand region of Bihar are in favor of a separate state, the party leaders from north Bihar are openly against the division of the state. Jagan Nath Misra, president of the Bihar State Congress Party Committee, has even threatened Delhi that, if the need arises he won't hesitate to support Laloo Prasad Yadav on this issue. The important point in Jagan Nath Misra's statement is that the separation of Jharkhand from Bihar will not only deprive the state of a large amount of natural resources, but it will also completely wipe out the Congress Party in north Bihar.

The Congress Party has not yet finalized its decision on the Jharkhand issue. V.N. Gadgil, the spokesman of the Congress Party, told reporters here today that the working committee of the Congress Party will make a decision after holding a discussion on it. At the same time he pointed out that the Central Government has not yet made up its mind on the Jharkhand issue.

Sandwiched between the opposite views of the government and the party, Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao will have to make a firm decision on Jharkhand in the near future. The Jharkhand followers have postponed their actions on the assurance given by the home minister that the Center will decide the issue by 15 September. Although the time limit can be slightly extended, a decision cannot be left pending for a long time.

The prime minister has not yet disclosed his views on this issue. If he agrees with the home ministry, then Jharkhand will either be a separate state or a union territory. In that case too the government is not going to confront any severe adverse reaction from the opposition parties. Between the two communist parties, the CPI [Communist Party of India] supports the demands for a separate Jharkhand. The party has revealed the basic difference between the BJP's [Bharatiya Janata Party] demand for a forest zone and the Jharkhand demand. Suraj Mandal, the co-chairman of the JMM, thanked the prime minister and the central home minister for expressing support for a separate Jharkhand state. This news has come from Ranchi. But there is no doubt that Chavan's unexpected statement has put different parties in a compromising position. A note of warning was very clear in the CPI-M [Communist Party of India-Marxist] politburo statement. Although the CPM-M leaders' statement today did not say clearly that they have never supported the demands for either a separate state or a union territory for Jharkhand, it was quite evident from the statements made that they were not at all prepared for such a quick signal from Chavan. Undoubtedly, there is no lack of sympathy inside the CPI-M in favor of the Jharkhand demand, but considering its effects on West Bengal the party had to oppose it. But the CPI and the IPF [Indian People's Front] have no such responsibility; therefore M. Farooqi of the CPI and Dipankar Bhattacharya of the IPF could state their support for a Jharkhand state in such clear terms.

On the other hand, both the BJP and the Janata Dal are in favor of smaller states. The BJP has proposed a split of its own administered state of Uttar Pradesh and the formation of a separate tribally populated state of Uttarkhand. BJP's strength is also very strong in the tribal regions of

Bihar. Therefore, it is quite evident that the BJP won't object to the formation of a separate state, though it might raise some questions on details. On the contrary, the BJP will try to show that it also has a major role to play in such decisions.

But the problem of the Janata Dal is completely different. Whatever might exist in the party's election manifesto, or whatever Vishwanath Pratap Singh [Janata Dal president] might utter on the party principles, to the party itself the issue is saving Laloo Prasad. Whatever Laloo Prasad might have said in favor of Jharkhand in the past, it is not possible for him now to follow the path of political self-destruction by agreeing to the division of Bihar; because then the people of north Bihar will not spare him. That is why Nitish Kumar said today: "If there are to be smaller states, then let Chavan start it by dividing his own state [Maharashtra] into Maradwara and Konkkon. Let them form the states of Chattisgarh, Uttarkhand, Gorkhaland, and so forth. Selecting only Bihar for splitting without splitting others, makes the Center's sinister political designs obvious." Nitish pointed out that the Janata Dal will even hold a strike to counter it. The supporters like Jagan Nath Misra in the Congress Party and the BJP leaders in north Bihar, who are determined to fight resolutely against the information of the Jharkhand state, are the only hope for the Bihar Janata Dal Party.

Jharkhand Statehood Might Incite Other Political Groups

93AS0018B Calcutta ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA
in Bengali 10 Sep 92 p 4

[Editorial: "Jharkhand: Which Way Lies Its Solution"]

[Text] Is the Jharkhand movement reaching its desired objective? Noticing the government attitude causes one to build up hope. S.B. Chavan, the central home minister, has unequivocally declared that the Center is ready to grant Jharkhand either of the two alternatives—status as a union territory or independent state. When the home minister openly says such a thing, then it can be presumed that the Central Government has practically reached a decision on this issue. The leaders of the Jharkhand movement have agitated for either an independent state or at least a union territory. The home minister's statement demonstrates the agitators' success—which they certainly deserve. For a long time they launched their movement in phases, against deception and discrimination and a lot of sacrifice. In that process they formed a party, split into splinter groups, then reunited, and again dissipated. But that did not in anyway dampen the movement, and except for a few violent disturbances here and there, the movement was conducted peacefully and democratically. Today, after such a long time, they are on the brink of fulfilling their hopes and aspirations.

The question arises: Will the attainment of an independent state or status of union territory end Jharkhand's problem of deception and discrimination? This question is old and it has been discussed and debated several times. Everyone is of the opinion that it is necessary to adopt and implement a large-scale socio-economic development program

to remove the backwardness in the Jharkhand region. Moreover, the Jharkhand people have some speciality and individuality in language, religion, culture, and custom, and those have brought to the forefront the issue of self-assertion. Because it is not possible to solve this problem of self-assertion through an economic development program only, the question of Jharkhand's becoming an independent state, a union territory, or a self-ruled region has been considered. The elected Bihar government also agreed to grant self-rule to Jharkhand. In this connection Chief Minister Laloo Prasad Yadav passed a resolution in the state legislative assembly. But the people of Jharkhand rejected a self-ruled council under any circumstances. They wanted to become either a union territory or an independent state. But it was difficult for the Bihar rulers to accept this demand because it would have literally meant the bifurcation of the state. Naturally, therefore, Laloo Prasad Yadav was plunged into a big problem. The home minister has rightly said that a definite proposal should come forward from the Bihar government itself on the Jharkhand issue. The area, which is being considered for status as a union territory is inside Bihar. The demand to include districts populated by Jharkhand people in other states has been withdrawn for the time being. By pushing the ball fully into Laloo Prasad Yadav's court, the home minister has to some extent compromised Yadav's position.

Laloo Prasad's position will be known shortly. But will there be anything left for the Bihar government to do when the Center has spontaneously indicated its acceptance of Jharkhand's demand for a separate state or union territory? The issue now is that, because becoming a union territory or independent state will not automatically solve the Jharkhand people's problems, it might provide impetus to the people in different tribal areas in various parts of the country—where the desire for self-determination has remained either dormant or is nascent—to come forward with their demand for separate states. The GNLF [Gurkha National Liberation Front] in Darjeeling has already demanded a separate Gurkhaland state; the Boro militants in Assam are asking for an independent Boroland; and the people of the Tarai region—adjacent to the Himalayas in Uttar Pradesh—have demanded a Uttarkhand. Will not those demands and the related movements get an impetus from Jharkhand's attainment of statehood? Has the home ministry prepared itself for that contingency and the reasonable consequences that follows? Do they want to provide this exception only in the case of Jharkhand? Or are they mentally prepared for the reorganization of the states of this republic on the basis of languages? It is necessary to find the answers to these questions. Regionalism, especially the provision of self-institution of the fragmented nationalism of tribal people, remained more or less dormant or alive everywhere in this diversified India. [sentence as published] Will that feeling be provoked if Jharkhand becomes a separate state?

Paper Interviews Janata President Swamy
93AS0097A Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English
5 Sep 92 p 7

[Interview with Dr. Subramanian Swamy, president of the Janata Party, by Sankarshan Thakur in New Delhi; date not given; "It Is Not My Job To Keep Other Parties Intact"; first paragraph is THE TELEGRAPH introduction; italicized and boldface words as published]

[Text] Dr. Subramanian Swamy, the man everyone loves to hate, tells Sankarshan Thakur he's not changed, it's all other politicians who've come around to his way of thinking.

Dr. Subramanian Swamy, president of the Janata Party, thinks he comes close to being the most misunderstood and misrepresented man on earth. Political adversaries revile him because they are either afraid of him or jealous; the Press is biased against him because it is informed by his enemies; the people are not behind him because they are yet to realise his worth—"you cannot blame me if people make the wrong decisions and elect people like V.P. Singh." The allegations against him are all malicious and motivated and so little praise comes his way because people just refuse to see the good that is in him. And if he is charged with violating ethics, it is only because they want to do in a man with genuine leadership qualities and a solid ideological programme. Dr. Swamy gave glimpses of the world according to him in an interview at his Safdarjung Road residence in New Delhi earlier this week. Excerpts:

Q: Dr. Swamy, do you realise how hated you are in certain sections because of your activities?

A: That doesn't matter. Anyone who is for change is bound to be hated by some people. There is also some hate that comes out of jealousy.

Q: Why would anyone be jealous of you?

A: Well, many think that they ought to be doing the things that I am doing, or that they should have achieved what I have achieved. I am not bothered. In any case, hate is a very negative emotion.

Q: Let's say dislike.

A: Oh, let them dislike. I am an activist and I speak my mind. I am not a hypocrite. But I also have very strong adherents, friends who are very solid friends.

Q: Where are these strong adherents and solid friends?

A: I wouldn't like to name them. Why should I?

Q: But isn't it true that through your political career you have burnt your boats with everyone you have been with?

A: That is your perception. The other perception is that I am friendly with everybody. How can you say I have burnt my boats with everybody? On the contrary, there is no section with whom I do not have the best of relations. If I have really burnt my boats how am I able to wean away so many people from a party as is being alleged?

Q: No, I am talking about the Jana Sangh which you began with. Then your quarrel with Chandra Shekhar...

A: Well, why did they change the name of the Jana Sangh? Why did they name it the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party]? I do not know who you are talking about in the Jana Sangh.

Q: People like Atal Behari Vajpayee, for instance...

A: Why do you want to name him? Don't deliberately personalise things. I may have a few people with whom I cannot get along but there are others I get along very well with.

Q: Even in the BJP?

A: Oh sure. One of the charges against Govindacharya within the BJP is that he has been meeting me.

Q: Why has Govindacharya been meeting you?

A: Nothing. Generally, I have known him for a long time. We meet, just like that.

Q: Is there a Tamil connection somewhere?

A: No, no. Govindacharya was mostly brought up in the north. But why single out Govindacharya, there are so many BJP MPs [members of Parliament] who come and meet me and discuss things.

Anybody who has a concrete programme and political policy will have a section against him. When I came into politics I had a specific programme which immediately annoyed the Communists. And they used their network to propagate against me.

In 1980 when the Jana Sangh fellows defected from the Janata Party and informed the BJP, I felt that it was wrong considering we had taken an oath at Rajghat that we will never leave the Janata Party. It was immoral of them to form another Janata Party by putting Bharatiya in front of it. And when I opposed that, their agencies also began to attack me.

The RSS [Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh] needs to keep the idea alive that anyone who parts company with them will disappear. But I have not disappeared. In fact, I have been with the same Janata Party since it was born and been true to the pledge we took. Apart from the two years when I was expelled. And I am surviving.

Q: That brings us back to the burning of boats. Why did you get expelled from the Janata Party in 1984?

A: Well, I contested elections for the president which is the normal democratic thing to do. Why Chandra Shekhar threw me out is for him to explain. In any case, the matter is closed. Chandra Shekhar and I have become very good friends.

Q: Despite the break between the Janata Party and the SJP [Samajwadi Janata Party]?

A: Oh yes.

Q: But why is it that you are among the handful of people left in the Janata Party now? Is it something wrong with...

A: I think very few Indian politicians have strong ideological convictions. Take the Congress Party. All through the Eighties when Narasimha Rao was the foreign minister

and I was in the Lok Sabha, he would criticise me for supporting relations with Israel. Now the whole Congress Party has shifted closer to the ideological package I have been advocating for the last 20 years.

Q: What is your broad ideological programme?

A: Decentralisation of the polity, market economy and a strong foreign policy in which you make strong friends but also work India towards becoming a pole in a multipolar world. And this is something I have been advocating. So when you have a strong ideological commitment, then a time comes when people coming and going cease to matter.

I have been talking about the normalisation of relations of China but the BJP and the Communists here used to be against it. Now they are all for it. They keep changing. They are always looking for slogans which are popular at the moment. They have ad hoc commitments.

So I suppose that is why I have stuck with the Janata Party, but surprisingly, people say I have changed parties when I have actually stuck to one. But that is the contribution of you media people.

Q: It is mostly your politician friends who spread such impressions...

A: Well, why don't journalists use their brains then? This is part of the problem that many of your editors have. They have mediocre academic backgrounds and they hate to see a politician who is more educated about them. That is part of the problem I have with some editors. They would like politicians who are dumber than them, who they can educate, who they can tell what to say. So some of your editors cannot stand me.

Q: Which editors are you talking about?

A: Why should I name them? Well, I can tell you some of them sit at the India International Centre puffing a pipe. They think they are great intellectuals. (*Laughs*)

Q: Don't you sometimes feel politically shunned and lonely, heading virtually a one-man party?

A: Anyone who adheres to a firm ideological programme can never feel lonely. It is only when you feel you must be in a groove or a pack that you feel lonely... The ideas must be there. And that is what I have. The greatness of this society is that individuals propagating an idea right from Adi Shankara to Chanakya and Vivekananda are honoured. Now, I am not comparing myself with them, I am only saying that I get inspiration from them. Once someone is tested against fire, meaning total opposition to his ideas by society, and he still sticks by those ideas, then ultimately people value you.

Q: So why doesn't your Janata Party get that kind of support?

A: Well, there has been an enormous growth in our support from 1989, when it was the butt of ridicule. You may not report it but the growth is there.

Q: But why does it not show in Parliament or in the state legislatures?

A: How can it? The Parliament elections took place in 1991 and I did not even fight. The Janata Party will be tested 10 years from now. When you are rebuilding a party from scratch, it is bound to take time and I am in no hurry.

Q: Why do you get blamed for breaking other parties?

A: But is it my responsibility for keeping other parties intact? If other parties break, it is their weakness.

Q: Weren't you at the centre of the recent split in the Janata Dal?

A: Yes, because all those people who broke away have great faith in me, in my intelligence and my legal acumen. And they have been talking to me. Instead of admitting their own mistakes, some people choose to blame me, but what can I do about that?

Q: But didn't you deliberately go after the Janata Dal? You wanted to break it.

A: Definitely. The Janata Dal and the RSS are, for different reasons, dangerous for Indian society and in the interests of Indian society they should be brought to an end.

Q: Why the Janata Dal [JD]?

A: The JD because it is an illegitimate organisation. They claimed it was formed with a merger of the Janata Party [JP] and the Lok Dal but they sought to liquidate the mission with which JP launched the Janata Party.

Q: You talk of illegitimacy, but the people of this country voted the JD to power.

A: Sure, but the people made a mistake. People can make mistakes, and in the long run they correct them too. And that is where leadership counts. V. P. Singh was a disaster. He called the JD a silly experiment. If it is a silly experiment, it should be wound up.

Q: You are helping wind it up.

A: Certainly. I will not miss any opportunity to finish off the JD or the RSS. If anybody seeks my help to finish them off, I will help them.

Q: Including monetary help.

A: Oh, those are just fraudulent allegations you people in the Press make. *Sunday*, which is your sister publication, has made these allegations.

Q: No, these allegations were made within Parliament House by some MPs.

A: Well, these were made by George Fernandes. He defended Morarji Desai in Parliament and within 24 hours did a somersault and went over to the other side. Such a disgraceful thing to do. Did he do that for money? When he left Lok Dal in 1983 and joined the Janata Party, did he do it for money? When he left Janata Party in 1989, did he do it for money? When V. P. Singh came out, lots of Congressmen said the CIA gave him money. These allegations are made all the time. One MP [member of Parliament] said I went to his house with Rs [Rupees] 25 lakhs in a briefcase. Does that kind of money fit into a briefcase?

Q: Maybe he meant an attache case.

A: *(Laughs)* Oh, I see, I see. How am I supposed to believe such things. He says he kept the money under his pillow. *(Laughs)* If indeed he was a spy of the Janata Dal, why did not make arrangements for tape-recording or video-recording?

But anyhow, I am ready for an ethics committee in Parliament. But ever since I said this committee should include a probe into the defection of the BJP from the Janata Party and George Fernandes' disgraceful somersault, both Fernandes and Advani have become silent. And now Advani has been found guilty by a Madhya Pradesh court. These are the people pointing fingers at me.

I know so many things about these people... I certainly told these MPs that leaving V.P. Singh will be a good thing, I certainly gave them legal advice. But all these allegations about money, am I supposed to believe it?

Q: But you took them to Holiday Inn hotel and...

A: Is Holiday Inn an illegal place? And we went there once for breakfast. For the kind of simple tastes we have, it is not at all costly. Government functions take place in these hotels all the time. What is wrong with going to the Holiday Inn?

All these things are ways of diverting attention from the real issues. What I am trying to do is to build a credible secular opposition to the Congress.

Q: But how can you do that? You are so pro-Congress.

A: How have I become pro-Congress? The Congress is pro-me. The ideology that the Congress is pursuing today is what I have been speaking about. They are following me.

Q: Don't you keep hobnobbing with bigwigs in the back-rooms of the Congress?

A: That is all wrong. You people are behind it.

Q: Can there be smoke without fire?

A: With you gentlemen of the Press, there can be. It is not difficult at all. Ask the Congress how come they are following the ideology of Dr. Swamy? Have they accepted Dr. Swamy's leadership? I am where I am. Lots of people are following me, that does not mean I am hobnobbing with them.

Q: This may probably be a rude question...

A: *(interjecting)* A rude question will get a rude answer. *(Laughs)*

Q: Where does the Janata Party get so much funds?

A: I know the thrust of your question. If the leader of a party is honest in using all the money that he gets for the party for the purposes of the party, there is enough money in the country. The problem is that most leaders in this country collect money and stash it away for personal use. If

anyone lifts a finger, I will be happy to appoint a commission of inquiry into the source of party funds. The Janata Party is the only party in India which files an income tax return. We are the only party which transfers money to state units through cheques.

Q: How is it done in other parties?

A: It is all cash payment, individual leaders to individual followers. Hegde will give cash to his followers, Sharad Yadav to his followers, Laloo to his followers, George Fernandes, who is probably the most corrupt minister there has been since 1947, will give it to his own followers.

Q: George Fernandes is the most corrupt minister since 1947...

A: Yes. I know you will make that the headline of my interview. *(Laughs)* If he is ready for a commission of inquiry, I will lead evidence against him.

Let him write to the Prime Minister saying he wants an inquiry and I will lead evidence against him right from the day he started in Karnataka as a defrocked padre. But I work the system which Mahatma Gandhi used. He could live in Birla's house, he used Birla's car, he used Birla's plane but nothing for himself. I collect money for public money, but I kept nothing for myself.

Q: Some say your money comes from the CIA.

A: You are recycling gutter gossip. Who has made that charge?

Q: It is a political charge made by politicians against you.

A: But who? Name them.

Q: They call you a CIA agent even in the Rajya Sabha, your political adversaries.

A: But who? I do not want to respond to gutter gossip. I can say that you are getting funds from the KGB because you personally have written in the past against me. What can you do about such allegations? How will you respond? For a number of issues the Americans have not liked me. I took a very strong line on Sri Lanka, do the Americans support that? I am for nuclear weapons for India, do the Americans support that? I am against many of the economic package proposals that the present government has accepted, is that a pro-U.S. position?

Q: They also call you a maverick and you seem to like that description.

A: Yeah, maverick means a person who does not accept the existing grooves of thought. If they use it in that sense for me I accept it because I am giving a breath of fresh air to the country, but I do not know in what sense most people are using maverick.

Q: They use it mostly in the sense that you are a loose cannon, a political assassin for hire...

A: Ah, ah, who has hired me, tell me. This kind of loose talk... I cannot... peoples' brains are loose cannons. Who has hired me to assassinate who?

Q: Ramakrishna Hegde...

A: Yes. But every single bit of paper I produced against Hegde was upheld by the commission of inquiry. You people in the Press are supposed to investigate who is doing what, and now that Hegde has been found out to be a crook, should I say that Hegde hired the Press?

Q: That's very unfair.

A: Why is it unfair? When I reveal the truth I become an assassin for hire but when you don't report the truth, what do you expect me to say about you lot? Don't I know which editor is on the payroll of which politician? I am not saying all are but some are.

Q: Why couldn't you have done similar investigative work on Bofors?

A: There were so many people doing that, why should I have duplicated their efforts. I said at that time, let all these criminals in the investigation like Ram Jethmalani and George Fernandes, let all of them get out of the investigation and let society as a whole say to me, Swamy you investigate Bofors, and I would have done it.

Q: But that needn't have prevented you from investigating Bofors. You just choose your targets. Do you choose targets?

A: Certainly. People who give me trouble. I try to find out what they are. If they are men of repute and honesty, I honour them. There are critics of mine like Cho Ramaswamy but they are also dear friends. Similarly N. Ram of *The Hindu*. He criticises me but he is also a friend. He is a man of integrity. But where I find a crook getting after me, I will not tolerate him. I will expose him.

Q: What did Hegde do to you?

A: He gave me trouble throughout. I was the one who built the Janata Party from 1980 to 1983 as general secretary. This fellow was just fooling around in disco clubs. But suddenly, just because he managed to persuade Chandra Shekhar, he was parachuted into chief ministership of Karnataka. And the first thing he does is to organise telephone tapping and I was his special target. He was politically opposing me.

Q: Are you doing the same to Jayalalitha now?

A: Not similar but she is also using the same abusive language now. The same abuses that Hegde used to utter at one time and THE TELEGRAPH used to print. He called me a man who defaces bathroom walls by writing pornographic slogans. But Jayalalitha is also saying similar things. She has turned out to be a failure as chief minister. Her continuance would mean the return of forces that are not conducive to our national interests. She has slackened her efforts against the LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam]. Her resignation is something I will campaign for.

Yadav Forms New Political Party

93AS0098A Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 30 Sep 92 p 1

[Text] The Times of India News Service, Lucknow, September 29—The much-awaited split in the Samajwadi Janata Party (SJP) came about today with its state president, Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav, finally severing ties with the party supremo and the former prime minister, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, by floating his new party—the Samajwadi Party.

A decision to this effect was taken here after a daylong meeting presided over by Mr. Yadav at his residence. The meeting was attended by 23 MLAs [members of Legislative Assembly] and 15 MLCs [members of Legislative Council] owing allegiance to Mr. Yadav. They later paraded before the speaker of the Uttar Pradesh [UP] assembly, Mr. Kesari Nath Tripathi, and the acting chairman of the U.P., Vidhan Parishad, Mr. Nityanand Swamy, to stake their claim to form a new party.

Importantly, presiding officers of both the houses without wasting much time recognised the new party and allotted them separate seats in the houses.

The undivided SJP had so far 33 MLAs and 25 MLCs in the state legislature. But with the split today, Mr. Yadav has emerged almost an unchallenged leader of the party having a support of more than two-thirds of the legislators.

The split for all practical purposes, has written off Mr. Shekhar for any political reckoning and reduced him almost to a non-political entity for the time-being.

The ardent supporters of Mr. Yadav termed the latest development a "welcome sign" for the party.

RBI Head Allegedly Knew of Security Scam

93AS0099A Calcutta THE STATESMAN in English
18 Sep 92 pp 1, 7

[Text] New Delhi, Sept. 17—The release of a set of "top secret" documents containing the internal correspondence between the Governor of the Reserve Bank of India [RBI], Mr. S. Venkitaramanan, and the then Deputy Governor, Mr. Amitabh Ghosh, has caused much consternation among the members of the Joint Parliamentary Committee [JPC]. The documents establish that the securities scam had been allowed to get out of hand despite Mr. Venkitaramanan's specific and repeated instructions over a period of four months beginning March, 1991, that the guilty be "dealt with severely".

The documents, released by a JPC member on Tuesday, prove that the RBI Governor not only knew of the "large-scale" fictitious transactions in Government securities a year before the scam was officially detected, but had also instructed Mr. Ghosh, through a strongly worded internal memo, to ensure that such transactions did not take place in the financial year 1991-92. In fact, it was after Mr. Venkitaramanan's repeated instructions that the RBI finally issued a circular dated July 26, 1991, to all bank

chairmen, warning them against conducting ready forward deals at rates which were not market-related and sale transactions without the backing of adequate securities or balance in the SGL [securities against granted loans] accounts.

The sequence of events leading to the despatch of the circular was like this. On March 20, 1991, the Governor noted in his memo to Mr. Ghosh that large-scale fictitious transactions were taking place in Government securities and instructed that any bank chairman found involved in such transactions be dealt with severely. Thereupon Mr. Ghosh sent a request to the Department of Banking Operations and Development of the RBI to take "immediate action". On June 17, 1991, the Governor, on a noting on the irregularities in UCO Bank which was part of a report prepared by the DBO and D [expansions not given], opined that there was no case for "further delay" and said instructions to stop the malpractices must be issued forthwith.

The report of the DBO and D on the "investment portfolio of banks—transactions in securities" confirmed the contents of the Governor's memo dated March 20, 1991. It said the following: most of the transactions were ready forward—outright transactions were comparatively few. Some banks had entered into double ready forward deals, banks cooperated and entered into transactions at agreed rates which had no relevance to the market rates, banks were facilitating brokers to take temporary positions in Government securities without involvement of their funds by issuing BRs on their behalf.

On July 23, 1991, Mr. Venkitaramanan expressed serious concern over the continuing malpractices and said he was worried that even after his instructions of March 20, 1991, no "deterrent" action had been taken. On July 26, the circular was issued.

The March 20, 1991, internal memo said this: "It has come to my notice that there is a practice of selling Government securities by individual banks even when they do not have adequate stocks of such scrips. All that the bank's exchange is certificates of forward sale and forward purchase, the whole process leading to considerable amount of abuse and corruption. Possibly the brokerage is being shared.

"I request DG(G) [expansion not given] may instruct the chairmen of banks to ensure that such transactions do not take place this year. Any bank chairman found to have indulged in such transactions will have to be dealt with severely. The message is to be conveyed particularly to chairmen of banks in Bombay and Delhi, where such transactions are reportedly taking place on a large scale. I would also suggest inspection by the inspectors of DBOD [expansion not given] of the securities department of the following banks" (the list is illustrative). "1. Bank of India 2. Bank of Baroda 3. United Bank of India 4. Canara Bank 5. Indian Bank. This should be attended to immediately".

Underneath this, Mr. Venkitaramanan made a handwritten noting which said: "While foreign banks are also involved, we have to take care".

The immediate questions these documents raise are: If Mr. Venkitaramanan was so agitated over the irregularities a year before the scam was officially detected, why did the scam assume the dimensions it has? Did Mr. Venkitaramanan convey his apprehensions to the Finance Ministry immediately so that the loopholes from that end could be plugged? If he did, what action did the Finance Ministry take? If he did not, why not?

Only two banks bothered to send in their compliance reports in response to the RBI's circular containing Mr. Venkitaramanan's instructions on security transactions. Did he take "severe action" against the rest for dereliction of duty? The State Bank of India [SBI] was one of the two banks which sent in compliance reports but it has now been proved that this report was most cursorily dealt with; that the SBI's executive committee, which has on it such members as the RBI deputy Governor, Mr. Janakiraman, approved it without applying its mind to it. How did Mr. Venkitaramanan accept a token and obviously fraudulent compliance report, when he knew exactly how serious the irregularities were and, more important, when the compliance report was in response to specific directions issued under his supervision?

Mr. Venkitaramanan talks of fictitious transactions, of considerable "abuse and corruption" and of the possibility of brokerage being shared (between brokers and bank officials) in March, 1991. Yet it was only a year later, in March, 1992, that he telephoned the SBI chairman, asking him to investigate Mr. Harshad Mehta's account. Why this delay, when Mr. Mehta, who is not even an approved broker for the SBI, was using it to deal in crores of rupees?

And finally, is Mr. Venkitaramanan's concern for the foreign banks merely a reflection of his interest in foreign investments?

Caption: Mr. Venkitaramanan's reaction to the irregularities in the UCO Bank is that there is no case for "further delay" (left). His exasperated complaint is that there has been no follow-up to his instructions (above). Both documents are appended to the DBO and D's report on the irregularities in security transactions. [Figure not reproduced]

VHP Leader Meets Press on Ayodhya Issue

93AS0096A Madras THE HINDU in English
21 Sep 92 p 9

[Text] Bangalore, Sept. 20—The Vishva Hindu Parishad [VHP] secretary-general, Mr. Ashok Singhal has said the organisation was hopeful of a solution to the Ramajanamabhoomi issue as the Prime Minister, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao "understood the sentiments of Hindus."

Mr. Singhal told presspersons today that in their talks with Mr. Rao, the Parishad leaders had told him to follow the line of Sardar Patel and "solve problems" and not that of Pandit Nehru which "created problems" like in Jammu and Kashmir and "suppressed Hindu organisations in particular and Hindu society in general."

Mr. Singhal said Mr. Rao should take the assistance of experts and give up the line of thinking that the disputed structure at Ayodhya was a mosque. It would be contempt of court to call it a mosque where no prayers were being offered by Muslims and the idol of Lord Rama had been installed. It was better for Mr. Rao to visit the Ramajanamabhooni at Ayodhya. The Union Home Minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan searched in vain for the mosque at the place. The results of the archaeological excavations at Ayodhya which had established the existence of a temple at Ramajanamabhooni were clinching evidence in support of their stand. The Muslims, especially the All India Babri Masjid Action Committee had no evidence to show that the mosque was built on a vacant land.

Mr. Singhal asserted that the temple had to be built at the site of Ramajanamabhooni, where Rama was being worshipped at Ayodhya today. If it were to be built elsewhere, it would be another temple for Sri Rama and not the Janmabhooni temple.

Muslims Should Be Persuaded

The Parishad was prepared to continue the talks for a solution. It was ready to cooperate with the Government and honour the verdicts of courts but at the same time was

also prepared for a confrontation. It was for the Muslims to give and take and stop thinking that they were aggressors, he said and the Government should persuade them. Mr. Singhal noted that the disputed structure at Ayodhya was not a wakf property. It was the property of the descendants of Mir Baqui, the Shia general of Babar who were not parties to the litigation. Moreover the Muslims of the area recognised it as Ramajanamabhooni. The petitions before the courts were not maintainable. The matter was in the court of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Singhal announced that the temple construction committee of the Parishad would meet on September 24 to review the talks with the Prime Minister. The Dharma Sansad, council of saints would meet in Delhi on October 30 and 31 to take stock of the situation. He accused a Muslim scholar, Ali Mia of provoking the Hindus by making the statement that every mosque in the country stood on the debris of a Hindu temple. So far, the VHP had respect for that scholar, but now it had to change its opinion.

The VHP was going ahead with the programme of consecrating 12,000 padukas of Lord Rama at Nandigram (near Ayodhya) from September 28. Pujas were being held in 5.5 lakh villages including 20,000 in Karnataka.

Officials Tell State of Nuclear Industry
93AS0100A New Delhi PATRIOT in English
 22 Sep 92 p 5

[Text] Bombay, Sept 21 (UNI)—The Indian nuclear industry is at the crossroads with the Government considering opening up the hitherto top secret industry to the joint sector to augment power generation.

According to official estimates, since commencement of operations the industry's cumulative power generation from eight nuclear stations in the country exceeded 74,709 million units till December, 1991.

Yet, the total installed capacity of 1,530 mw falls far short of the targetted 10,000 mw by the year 2000. It is planned to increase substantially the installed capacity by another 5,760 mw but the allocation for this purpose has to be drastically reduced, mainly due to paucity of funds.

Claiming that Indian scientists have translated Homi Bhabha's vision to make India a member of the exclusive nuclear club, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC) director R. Chidambaram said one of the earliest decisions taken by the Indian Atomic Energy Commission was to build a research reactor at Trombay which had helped the country gain experience and confidence in handling nuclear reactors.

Besides, a research reactor was an ideal facility to provide neutron beams for carrying out research in basic science as well, he said.

The Apsara, Cirus and Dhruva reactors at BARC had operated satisfactorily during 1991-92 and more than 2,000 samples were irradiated for isotope production.

BARC had laboratories for carrying out research in the fields of physics, chemistry, biology, agriculture, medicine, food technology, isotope technology, and nuclear engineering metallurgy which could be exploited by the joint sector.

Dr. Chidambaram said the Indian industry had to cooperate with the nuclear industry by producing quality equipment to ensure that safety hazards were eliminated.

The work done at Dhruva had enabled production of radioactive isotopes of high specific activity for use in industry. Dhruva had significantly augmented the radio-isotope production capacity of the nation and a number of new isotopes for use in medicine could be produced, he said.

However, the nuclear scientist opined that export of nuclear knowhow to set up power in Third World countries was still a distant dream, as the installed capacity targets in the country were yet to be met.

An order for a triple axis neutron spectrometer received from the International Atomic Energy Agency for supply to Bangladesh was completed last year. Vietnam had also evinced keen interest in importing nuclear knowhow, he said.

The gross nuclear power generation in 1991-92 was estimated at about 5,500 million units. The generation in 1991

was less compared to the preceding year, mainly due to the outages taken for maintenance and mandatory in-service inspection jobs.

The liquid and gaseous radioactive releases from all nuclear stations were well below permissible levels and the limits prescribed by the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) according to the Department of Atomic Energy's (DAE) annual report.

The nuclear power corporation earned a net profit of Rs [Rupees] 74.32 crore in 1990-91, a sum of Rs 547 crore was raised from the capital market for investment in new projects.

The 220 mw Kakrapar Atomic Power Project in Gujarat attained criticality this month while the Narora atomic power station's unit two was synchronised to the national grid on January 5, 1992.

Another 220 mw unit is planned at Kakrapar in addition to six 220 mw units at Kaiga, two 220 mw and four 500 mw units at Rajasthan, two 500 mw units at Tarapur and two 1,000 mw units at Kudandulam totalling 7,200 mw.

DAE and AERB sources said that except for maintenance and outages, the nuclear power stations were running satisfactorily. In Rajasthan, unit one was working half to its installed capacity of 200 mw due to a defective end shield.

The regulatory board had restricted operation of the unit beyond 100 mw since 1987, consequent on the repair of the south-end shield.

In 1991-92, the Madras atomic power station Pressurised Heavy Water Reactor (PHWR) unit one was rehabilitated due to failure of the main generator transformer. An additional third moderator heat exchanger was commissioned at this unit.

At Narora, based on operational experience of PHWRs, both the units had been rerated to 220 mw each. The unit had to take relatively longer outages for implementing certain safety related improvements such as addition of a third emergency diesel generator set and some improvements in the emergency core cooling system.

The transmission system for power evacuation from Kakrapur was under execution through the Gujarat Electricity Board, along with commissioning of two 220 kv transmission lines.

At Kaiga, construction activities were on in full swing and based on the present status of civil construction works, the two units were expected to achieve criticality in 1996.

For Rajasthan's project three and four, award work for natural draft cooling towers was in progress while bids were under evaluation for induced draft cooling towards.

Quarters dispensary, school, hospital and sheds had come up. The tender for nuclear piping had been floated and work on at least 17 packages had been awarded.

Progress Reported in Solar Technology

93AS0081A Madras THE HINDU in English
19 Sep 92 p 6

[Text] Gurgaon (Haryana), Sept. 18—India today joined the select band of countries which have developed amorphous silicon required for solar power generation. The Prime Minister, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao, dedicated a pilot amorphous silicon solar cell plant in Gurgaon.

The plant has been set up by the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited (BHEL) in association with the Ministry of Non Conventional Energy Sources.

The Prime Minister hoped that the new plant would help provide electricity to the farflung areas. Mr. Rao said the Government would utilise solar energy to electrify one lakh remote villages in the country during the Eighth Plan. He felt that non-conventional sources would help achieve this.

The Prime Minister wanted engineers to turn their attention to what other advantages non-conventional energy sources could provide to the people. "Where the people already have electricity, the non-conventional energy source can be used to run water pumps or other items."

Turning to the advantages of the photovoltaic cell technology, the Prime Minister said this would help cut down the irregular power supply many parts now faced.

Mr. Rao wanted the cost of the technology to be reduced so that it could be used by the masses. He stressed that while every other source of energy would dry up eventually the energy of the sun was unlimited.

Mr. Rao said the advent of this technology would help cut the wastage that, he felt, was prevalent in every field.

The Haryana Chief Minister, Mr. Bhajan Lal, chose the occasion to hit back at those who had opposed his Government's move to provide the land to the Centre free of cost. He urged the Prime Minister to visit Haryana on November 1 when the State celebrates its 25th anniversary.

On arrival, the Prime Minister was taken round the plant and shown its working. The amorphous silicon solar cell plant has been termed an ultra modern facility for research, development and pilot production, equipped with sophisticated computer controlled plant and machinery. Built at a cost of Rs [Rupees] 16 crores it is stated to be one of the few of its kind in the world.

The Governor of Haryana, Mr. Dhanik Lal Mandal, the Union Minister of State for Industry, Mr. P.K. Thungon, the Union Minister of State for Planning and Programme Implementation, Mr. Sukh Ram, and the Union Minister of State for Wasteland Development, Col. Ram Singh participated in the function.

NTIS
ATTN PROCESS 103
5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD VA

2

22161



This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal names and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Central Eurasia, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.